DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 233 939 SO 014 926

AUTHOR Battistoni, Richard M.
TITLE Civic Education in America.
PUB DATE Mar 83
NOTE 48p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwestern Social Science Association (Houston, TX, March 16-19, 1983).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Citizen Participation; *Citizenship Education; *Civics; Communication Skills; Democracy; *Educational Change; Educational History; *Educational Needs; Educational Vouchers; History Instruction; Interdisciplinary Approach; Models; Secondary Education; Secondary School Curriculum; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

The liberal and participatory-republican models of what constitutes a democratic citizen have implications for the civics curriculum and for the structure of secondary school institutions. The major problem with civic education today is a lack of integration, reflecting a liberal conception of education which sees the role of politics in our lives as minimal and, therefore, minimizes the functions of overt civic education. The participatory-republican model, on the other hand, holds politics to be an intrinsic part of an individual's life and requires a civic education characterized by constant public activities and exercises and would require an integration of the high school curriculum. For example, the lessons of history (necessary to guide an individual as he acts in the present), and communication and rhetorical skills (necessary for effective citizen participation) would be fully integrated into a civics course. Under this model, not only social studies, but the entire curriculum would address itself to citizenship education. And, lastly, the school structure itself would change under this model. For example, one viable alternative structure, the system of education vouchers, would have an effect on education. (RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED233939

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Richard M. Battistoni

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CIVIC EDUCATION IN AMERICA

Richard M. Battistoni
Department of Political Science
Baylor University

Prepared for delivery at the 1983 Annual Meeting of the Southwestern Social Science Association, Houston, Texas, March 16-19, 1983.

SO 014 936

"We have physicists, geometricians, chemists, astronomers, poets, musicians, and painters in plenty; but we have no longer a citizen among us; or if there be found a few scattered over our abandoned countryside, they are left to perish there unnoticed and neglected"

-Rousseau, Discourse on the Arts and Sciences

Every modern polity engages in the practice of political education. In all modern societies, people must be taught the values underlying the social order and the workings of their political institutions, in order to engage in any sort of political activity, whether sustaining or reforming of political practices. All political communities need to instill in their citizens in one way or another basic feelings of political trust and loyalty, to insure the ongoing resilience of the fabric of the political order. Through a conscious civic education, individual members of the polity are transformed into "citizens," thus enabling them to exercise their rights and perform their public duties. Since all of these qualities are not innate, and are not learned systematically in private spheres such as the family, they must be taught and learned under some type of public support and guidance.

Civic education is especially important to democratic societies. In a democracy, the reliance on the people to make deliberate choices about the direction their collective lives and energies should take makes it crucial that the citizenry be educated. George Washington, in his farewell address, understood that "in proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened."[1] Citizens need to possess the cognitive skills and abilities necessary to responsibly participate in democratic politics. In addition, the rights and freedoms accorded in a democracy makes it especially imperative that democratic states teach the citizens the public responsibilities that go along with democratic rights as well as the moral and cultural foundations which bind the political order together. Even those who would challenge the very foundations and

institutions of particular democratic regimes have recognized the potential importance of political education as a precondition to that form of political activity which aims at radical social change (witness the growing number of Marxists involved in the study of political education, and not merely the "indoctrinational" or"hegemonic" aspects, but also the potentially liberating ones).

Given the importance of citizenship education to democratic societies, we would expect to find a coherent articulation of the form and content of American civic education, as well as concrete practices corresponding to such an articulation. Contemporary America, however, seems to be undergoing a crisis in civic education. Over the past twenty years there has been a continuous erosion of shared political values in American society. There is no longer a concern for "things political" among our nation's youth, nor a commitment to participate in the making of political decisions, at any level. Robert Pranger has argued that "the citizen, whose chief duty is to participate, is disappearing as an important political actor."[2] David Mathews, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare during the mid-1970's, laid out the problem of citizenship education in this way:

> Being a citizen today is essentially a spectator sport. Citizenship education is little more that learning what others do to make and execute the policies of government. Citizenship cannot be remote. The disinterested citizen becomes disengaged, the disengaged citizen becomes disillusioned, and disillusionment leads to despair. We may well be witnessing the kind of citizen dropout that Thomas Jefferson imagined when he asked, in his first inaugural address, if the American experiment in self-government might be withering for lack of energy to sustain it.[3]

Political socialization studies have found that all three of the major "agents" of American citizenship education, the schools, the family, and the communications media, have generally been unable to instill political values or the necessary norms of political activity in its future citizens.[4] The very fact that political scientists talk about "political socialization" (which, as opposed to "political

education," tends to focus on more casual learning and the latent internalization of social and political attitudes) indicates that we have abandoned the idea that any "agent" in modern liberal democracies can consciously and directly "educate" active democratic citizens. Moreover, the fact that many schools give grades for "citizenship" based on a student's neatness, politeness, submission of homework on time, and passive obedience to school rules suggests that our "educators" have even forgotten what it means to be a democratic citizen.

Indeed, the events of the past decades have accelerated our society's declining capacity to teach citizen norms and skills, especially in the schools. The launching of Sputnik by the Soviet Union in 1957caused a national response in the late 1950s and 1960s that emphasized technical and specialized education in secondary schools. Achievement in mathematics and the sciences was stressed over other traditional subjects in the "humanities." Education was increasingly held to be important to reach personal and technical national goals, but the general goal of the creation of better citizens was not directly addressed in this period.[5]

Beginning in the late 1960s and continuing into the present, people have begun to address the problems of discrimination, unequal opportunity, and "free choice" in education. In the last fifteen years, the courts have been increasingly used to eliminate inequalities and discriminatory practices, and to challenge certain mandatory practices in the schools. Issues such as sexual and racial discrimination, school busing, "student rights," school prayer, and compulsory school attendance have all been subjects of recent litigation in various courts across the country.

The increasingly litigious and legalistic nature of the public schools, and especially secondary schools, has not contributed to overcoming the current crisis in civic education. The growing recourse to the courts and to the judicial process

in educational matters signals a failure to maintain or achieve any community of meaning (along with signaling a complete distrust of public authority) in the schools. Some may see the growing use of the courts as a sign of the return of politics to the schools. But all legal actions of this sort have done is further fragment and factionalize different groups within the school, dividing students, teachers, and parents into different "classes" and "interests." The involvement of the courts in the schools only "educates" future citizens as to their differences, to their separation from one another, and their rights as separate entities; it does not teach common values or public responsibilities.[6]

In light of our contemporary crisis in political education, this paper attempts to explore the question of American civic education by first looking to the tradition of political philosophy to determine what constitutes "the democratic citizen." Before we can understand how to better educate citizens in our democratic values and practices, we must first know what it means to <u>be</u> a democratic citizen. Two "models" of democratic politics and citizenship immediately suggest themselves as alternative conceptions running through American political life: what I call the "liberal" and the "participatory-republican" models. While the liberal model of democratic citizenship informs most of the practices in American schools with regard to citizen instruction, the alternative model has been a powerful one in our nation's history, and may better inform our present practices in citizenship education that the liberal conception. After briefly examining these two theoretical models, the paper will look at the implications of these for specific practices in secondary schools,[7] here focusing on a couple of areas in particular: the civics curriculum and the structure of secondary school institutions as it relates to civic education. By proceeding in this way, this paper hopes to begin exploring the ramifications of school policies and practices for citizenship training, in light of what it means to be a democratic citizen, and point the direction

to changes that can be made in such practices.

I

Civic education in American schools is primarily informed by what I will call the liberal conception of democratic politics and citizenship.[8] The liberal model begins with a conception of human psychology which sees people as inherently isolated due to the ultimate subjectivity of human wants and interests. Given its foundations in epistemological individualism and psychological hedonism, the liberal conception of politics sees people's ends as inevitably private. However, the conflict created by individuals who have different interests which are often not reconcilable leads to a demand for some kind of political order to mediate the conflict. Adherents to the liberal conception want to create a political order which can regulate the anarchy of subjective human activity and yet allow the individual the greatest possible purview to choose his own particular ends and the means to satisfy them.

Under the liberal conception, politics and political activity are purely instrumental. Liberal man enters into politics "only with an intention in every one the better to preserve himself his liberty and property."[9] The polity is never seen as a source of values in its own right; all values emanate from private individuals. There may be a sharing of values or purposes in the polity, but this is better understood as a coalition of interests which is contingent, and indeed precarious, given the subjectivity of interest. Government for liberals is ideally envisioned as the region where general, impersonal laws and disinterested judges provide the peace and security under which each can pursue private interests.[10]

Democracy as a political form is only preferred by liberals due to the sub-

jectivity of people's desires and the equality of their claims for the satisfaction of such desires. We have different interests, and different opinions about what the public realm should do in accordance with those interests. Since no opinion is inherently "right" or "wrong," we all deserve an equal say in the final form any public resolution of our differences will take. Our participation in politics is more of a defensive strategy than a self-fulfilling activity. Democracy seems mandated only to give equal protection to individuals against incursions on their rights or interests by possibly arbitrary decrees of self-interested rulers, to insure the responsibility of the governors to the interests of the governed. The liberal enters the public realm as a free and independent entity with particular personal desires, and the political system allows, nay guarantees, the continuation of his particularity and isolation.

The liberal model of the democratic citizen, where present at all, is minimalist in nature. The "good citizen" is one who internalizes certain rules and standards of public behavior that are useful in providing for the orderly accomodation of private wishes in the public realm. He should know the laws of his state, along with the punishments that go along with disobeying them, and thus understand that it is in both his short-term (the immediate punishment) and long-term interest (the knowledge of a world in which laws were not obeyed by anyone) to uphold such laws. The "good citizen" will participate in politics to the extent necessary to provide for his particular interests; he will vote for public officials and legislators who will "represent" him in public affairs, and may from time to time fulfill the duties of some public office himself. But he will not generally participate <u>directly</u> in the making of laws or public policy with his fellow citizens. Participation does not define the role of the democratic citizen under the liberal model. Neither will he he be transformed into a "public man" by his minimal political activity; his

character is not altered in political life. The role of "good citizen" is secondary to, if even a part of, what liberals consider being a "good man."[11]

The model of civic education which corresponds to the liberal conception of democratic citizenship minimizes the role of direct civic instruction by the state. Since it is not one of the purposes of politics to educate or cultivate the character of citizens, and given that the citizen is so narrowly defined, liberals see very little educative potential, and great potential for abuse, in political institutions or authorities which try to teach the values or norms of citizenship. Liberal society must teach its young certain rules and standards of public behavior and obedience to law so as to provide for the orderly accomodation of private wishes in the public realm; people must be given the education that enables them to rule themselves with a minimum of political organization and involvement. It is not the function of education to transform men into "citizens," only to facilitate their existence together as distinct individuals. People must be taught to order their behavior in line with certain social rules, but not to transcend their legitimate particularity in line with a non-existent "public good."

There is an alternative model of the democratic citizen, however; one whose vision of the citizen and of civic education has often existed alongside the liberal model in the history of American thought, and whose articulation may offer a solution to the problem of citizen education in contemporary American society. This model, which I call the participatory-republican model, goes beyond the simple hedonism and subjectivism of liberal psychology. The participatory-republican conception of human psychology contends that human beings are both rational and passionate, and that the individual psyche is only healthy when reason and desire are properly integrated. Similarly, the participatory-republican model believes that we are not completely separate and independent beings, but have similarities

with others, share ends and purposes, and desire various forms of union with other persons--the psychological truth is that individuals are both independent from and dependent upon other individuals.[12]

What truly distinguishes the participatory-republican model from the liberal one is that it maintains that man has an inherent need for political life, that he can only actualize his complete self in political activity. According to the participatory-republican conception, democratic politics exists not only to recognize individuals, their interests, and their claim to personal satisfaction, but also to bring individuals into an active, participatory community in which the individual's interests become transformed into the general interest of public law and policy, based on the commonality and dependence each citizen shares with one another. While liberals posit a policy based upon disinterested procedures which can be utilized by individuals to pursue their divergent interests, participatory-republicans posit institutions that begin with individuals who have diverse particular interests and know about themselves and their unique situations, but who also have strong social attachments to their fellows. Political institutions and procedures are set up with the formulation of general rules and common norms out of such contending interests in mind. The participatory-republican theory of politics starts with particular divisions to arrive at the public unity, albeit a unity which embodies the individual's particular desires.[13]

Whereas the liberal conception holds man to be fundamentally apolitical, the participatory-republican model holds that people need political association. Under this conception, citizens share common norms and values and yet treat each other as individual agents deserving equal respect. They come together in face-to-face association to deliberate over the issues requiring public action. The government is not only minimally involved in people's lives, extracting "mere obedience" to

its laws in order to provide a baseline for individuals to pursue their interests in private; but rather, the political community exists to transform individuals and their interests, "penetrat(ing) into a man's inmost being and concern(ing) itself no less with his will than with his actions."[14]

The participatory-republican model of the democratic citizen also differs from its liberal counterpart. Citizenship is not understood as a minimal duty which involves following certain rules of behavior and voting for those who will represent us in the public arena. According to the participatory-republican ideal, the "good citizen" has strong ties to his political community, and takes part in common ends and concerns with his fellow citizens. The participatory-republican citizen is understood as "a man who shares in the administration of justice and in the holding of office,"[15] and is thus, following Jefferson's characterization, "a participator in the government of affairs."[16] Citizens discuss, decide, and act together to make public policy, and through such direct participation in politics, each individual's character is altered: his purview is expanded, his private interest is changed into the law of the polity, and his personality is made more complete. Since participatory-republicans would contend that to be fully human means to be a member of a political community, to be a "good man" under their definition, one must also be a "good citizen."[17]

A proper political education is crucial to the participatory-republican model of democracy. In order to make people capable of becoming active, equal participants in the affairs of their community, their capacities to do so must be set to work: citizens, through civic education, must be "made worthy of liberty and capable of bearing it."[18] Participatory-republicans understand that there is a real danger in divorcing the powers which they place in the hands of the people from the knowledge adequate to the exercise of these powers.

But more than this, the participatory-republican ideal maintains that only a

publicly conducted civic education can avoid the pitfalls of the liberal method and properly mould individuals who are both complete men and citizens. Only an education characterized by constant public activities and exercises involving the mutual learning of all can strengthen the "public self" against the "individual self" and thereby educate the "whole man" (as the participatory-republican psychology conceives of him).[19] An education conducted amongst one's fellows can develop men who are autonomous and yet recognize their dependence on others, and can make them fit for egalitarian social relations. Where the liberal conception sees the role of politics in our lives as minimal and instrumental, and therefore minimizes the functions of overt civic education, the participatory-republican view holds politics to be an intrinsic part of an individual's life, and requires a "transformational" civic education in line with this view.

II

Having completed this brief discussion of the two major conceptions of democratic politics and citizenship and their general implications for political education, it remains the task of this paper to explore contemporary issues in American public schooling which affect the education of citizens. Since it is impossible to examine all of the school practices which affect civic education in America in the course of this essay, we will single out the two issues of the general curriculum and structure of secondary schools, applying our theoretical discussion of democratic citizenship to these two particular issues. In this way we can at least get a glimpse of the implications of our theoretical discourse for contemporary practices in American high schools.

Citizenship education in American high schools is conducted almost exclusively through the social studies curriculum. Social studies classes have long been the

place in American high schools where students are taught the traits and skills that make up "good citizenship." But this is not to say that the character of civics instruction has not changed--indeed, since the beginning of the century, curricular theory and practice in the social studies has undergone a number of major changes.

At the turn of the century, history was the disciplinary vehicle by which students were brought to an understanding of the values and behavior underlying democratic citizenship. Educators of the time argues that history was "the repository of the great classical ideas and ideals of humankind that were prerequisite to effective democratic citizenship," and was thus the only course of study needed to sufficiently "discipline the faculties of the mind" in preparation for entrance into the world of democratic politics.[20] The object was for the student to master a body of historical "facts"--names, dates and events in political, diplomatic and military history--to be "learned by heart, and when forgotten, learned again."[21] These recommendations were strongly influential in the social studies curriculum almost universally into the 1920's, and in some cases into the 1940's.

By the 1920's, however, social studies educators began to dismiss "history for the sake of history" as the dominant mode of instruction in the civics curriculum. They argued that in order to help students become good citizens now and in the future, a curriculum with items more relevant to current political situations and social relationships needed to be developed. What came out of the criticism from these (mostly "progressive") social studies educators was the practice of dividing the high school curricula into a history sequence, consisting of memorizable content as before, but streamlined into one course in world history and one in American history, and a "problems of democracy" course (or something

like it) in the 12th grade, where students would analyze and familiarize themselves with contemporary political and social issues. History was somewhat separated from that part of the social studies curriculum which specifically dealt with citizenship education.[22] The "problems of democracy" approach to civics instruction is still used in many schools today.[23]

But findings from public surveys in the 1940's made people question whether this "social problems" approach was valid for teaching citizen values. It was found that high school graduates, whether they had taken social studies courses or not, were not able to recall important facts about American history and government. The high schools and their civics curricula were put under attack for a failure to provide proper citizenship training, which led to another transformation in the social studies curriculum in the 1960's, the creation of "the new social studies."

Spurred on by federal funding, the new thrust in curricular practice was to teach courses in the separate disciplines of "social science." It was felt that to shore up the previously "soft" social studies (also called "social slush" and "social stew" by critics), students should be taught the scientific method of inquiry used in the study of each of the social science disciplines, in effect making them "junior sociologists," "political scientists," "psychologists," and "geographers." Representatives from each social science discipline (in the university) developed separate "units" to be plugged into the social studies curriculum in the high schools, usually consisting of mini-versions of texts and materials used at the university level.[24] It was believed that not only was the study of the academic social science disciplines by high school students good in itself, but that it would also produce better, more informed citizens. Bernard Berelson justified the study of academic social disciplines in this way:

> We want to give high school students the best introduction we can, within limits of practicality, to the best available knowledge from the social science disciplines as a means to the end of producing responsible citizens.[25]

For these social scientists, then, citizenship would be improved "when people have learned how to look at the world through the eyes of social scientists."[26] The "social science disciplines" approach to the social studies curriculum, though it has lost much of its initial impact, still informs many school programs in "civics education." In fact, many schools have discarded their 12th grade government or "problems of democracy" courses in favor of social science electives, such as sociology and psychology.[27]

Critics have argues that the "new social studies" reforms of the 1960's made the civics curriculum much too subject centered. Educators have attempted to get students to master the contents and approaches of social science disciplines, with no attention paid to substantive values (social science is, after all, value free!).

A concern that values were being neglected in the social studies curriculum led to the development in the past decade of two alternative approaches in civic education, values clarification and moral development. The values clarification approach centers on encouraging students to examine standards and guides which underlie their everyday behavior, understand the process of choosing among and committing oneself to certain values and then acting on them, and respecting the values and commitments made by others. Advocates of values clarification believe that people who have rationally examined and chosen their values after discussion and challenge in the classroom will be better citizens, since many civic problems result from confusion over values.

But the values clarification approach focuses instruction only on "the process of valuing, not on the transmission of the 'right' set of values." It is a highly personal process, with teachers merely trying to get individual students to think about and "clarify" what they value--no one person's values have greater

merit than another's. Sidney Simon, a major proponent of values clarification, argues that it is illegitimate to attempt to inculcate, instill, or foster values, having come to "the realization that all the inculcating, instilling, and fostering added up to indoctrination."[28] There is very little discussion of politics or the development of collective or community values in any of the values clarification literature, even though it is purportedly a method of civic education--in fact, values clarification is predicated upon the belief that there are no common values (for certain) given all the diversity we find around us.[29]

The values clarification approach to citizenship education reflects the liberal concern over the possibility that the teaching of common political values will produce men and women who accept uniformly and uncritically a set of imposed beliefs, thus interfering with people's freedom. Many contemporary advocates of values clarification techniques feel that the instilling of common norms of behavior will enforce the status quo, stifling social change and forcing minorities to acquire the values of white middle class society.

But this seems overdrawn, given that there is a critical, cognitive component to any conception of democratic citizenship education. If, as participatory-republicans contend, political community is only possible where people are bound together by a common reverence for the same conception of politics, justice and virtue, the instilling of common values and purposes is necessary as a foundation for doing anything politically, reforming as well as preserving the status quo. In fact, the internalizing of principles of equality, democratic participation, and freedom and diversity which make up the core of democratic politics should lead to a keener awareness of problems and tensions with these principles in practice, and to a motivation to act in changing such practices. Moreover, it seems more discriminatory of "minority values" to condescendingly argue, as much of the values clarification literature and materials do, that certain people are

"legitimate" in valuing lawlessness, disrespect for authority, indolence, or selfishness rather than challenging them to search together for common sets of values.[30]

The moral development approach to citizenship education comes out of the research of Lawrence Kohlberg and his colleagues about the stages of cognitive moral development. Kohlberg found that people think in qualitatively different ways about moral issues, progressing from preconventional and conventional modes of thought to more principled stages of moral thinking in the course of congnitive development over time in their lives. Given that the highest stages of moral thinking reflect attitudes toward justice, rights, and liberty that are most appropriate to citizenship, the object of the curriculem ought to be to facilitate progress in people's moral development. Kohlberg and associates have found that initiating moral discussions about hypothetical or real moral dilemmas helps students confront moral issues and their thinking about them which then facilitates their movement to higher stages of cognitive moral development.[31] These findings have led to proposals and programs which use "moral development methods" as the primary guide to instruction in the social studies.[32] Kohlbergian educators have attempted to overcome "traditional civic education" which, in their view, "taught students facts and generalizations about American society and its history and attempted to instill in them a love of country and its institutions," substituting a civics education program which focuses on intellectual skills and processes and the discussion of and participation in "moral dilemmas" which brings students to a higher stage of conceptualization about moral and political issues.[33]

The moral development approach represents a refreshing attitude toward civic education. The approach begins to be concerned with the total curriculum as it affects moral and citizenship education, not just social studies classes. There is a strong participatory element to the moral development curriculum, involving

students directly in governing themselves through community meetings within the schools (although Kohlberg and his associates chalk up all the beneficial results of participation in school to the "better moral atmosphere developed in a school based firmly on the findings of research in cognitive moral development"[34] rather than the more probable conclusion that participation in a community of peers brings with it affective as well as cognitive bonds to others and a sense of self that positively change one's attitudes and behavior). Kohlberg's civics curriculum also stresses cognitive skills which are important to any notion of citizenship, and the doing away with parts of the "hidden curriculum" which teach radically different (and "undemocratic") lessons from the overt curriculum.

Buth there are also serious problems with this approach to citizen education. First of all, most of the suggestions of the kinds of moral dilemmas and discussions that are to be used in high school classroom settings are of an interpersonal nature (e.g., Should Jill turn in her friend Sharon for cheating/stealing? or Should a Christian girl in Nazi Germany hide a Jewish friend from the Gestapo and thereby jeopardize her own family?). The dilemmas presented are both not very complex in nature, and do not usually involve any larger social or political group; that is to say, there is little political content to the moral issue discussions which make up a large bulk of the curricular proposals of the moral development approach. In addition, the thrust of the moral development literature denies that part of citizenship which is characterized by one's caring for the affairs of one's community, the mutual sharing of concern among community members, and the other affective as well as cognitive bonds which make people able to engage in common political action. The overriding thrust of the advocates of moral development is with fostering cognitive skills and competencies, not with the important affective roots and foundations for the working out of public policy disputes and moral conflicts which are recognized under a partici-

patory-republican view of citizenship. In fact, by attempting to attach people to abstract universal principles of justice and right, Kohlberg's method of instruction may even have the effect of extricating people from localized bonds of community and political commitment, as these are seen as being too "parochial."

Finally, again from a participatory-republican point of view, the universal ethical principles which make up the highest stage of moral development ("Stage Six") and which are the basis for Kohlberg's vision of good citizenship seem little distinct from (hardly universal) liberal political principles. Stage Six is characterized by a sense of self-esteem, concern for one's rights and liberties (compatible with those of others, of course), adherence to principles of contract, free agreement, and consent, and the political belief in individual participation (one man, one vote) and the sanctity of individual conscience in conflictual political matters. By presenting ethical responses characteristic of the highest stage of moral development as universally valid, the moral development school merely attempts to give grounding and certainty to the disputed liberal principles of political right, which according to participatory-republicans, make up only a portion of the picture of democratic politics and citizenship.

In addition to these just mentioned, there have been a number of other approaches to the civics curriculum which have been proposed and implemented. Yet with all of these curricular innovations over the past 50 years, most observers agree that all of the burden for citizenship education in the high school curriculum still lies in narrowly conceived social studies courses, which for the most part have failed to generate student interest, involvement, or competence in political life.[35] A cross-national study contended that, no matter what has happened in the way of curricular reform, the still relatively small amount of time devoted to civic education makes it impossible to cover the major cognitive and affective

areas of citizenship, and as a result, students are not able to demonstrate competence in all of the cognitive and affective traits that make up the democratic citizen.[36]

Indeed, it is these very curricular innovations which are responsible for a good part of the problem in citizenship education. The problem with much of the curricular reform of the past two decades is that it was university-based and grew out of a dissatisfaction with the teaching method or contents of particular subjects, so that new proposals and projects were put forth or added to existing curricula: reformers "never really attacked the curriculum as a whole."[37] Moreover, the tendency in teacher training programs is to prepare future social studies instructors in individual subject matter areas, such as history, geography, economics, or government, without integrating all into one curriculum or integrating other fields which might be relevant to citizenship.[38] This lack of integration is reflected in the cafeteria or supermarket-style atmosphere which is found in the high schools generally, where it is assumed that "variety and innovation are desirable qualities in a high school curriculum," and a high school is thought to be improved because "it offers more courses" now than it did previously.[39] But while there are more than 250 courses offered in some high schools, basic citizenship skills and values go unlearned.

The lack of an integrated approach is the major problem with most of the current practices in the schools. In some ways this reflects a "liberal" conception of education. For just as liberal psychology and politics deal in the aggregation of separate phenomena (whether it be interests, persons, or desires) to get "the whole," so too does the dominant philosophy in the schools "add up" each separate course of study to get "the whole" of the curriculum. Moreoever, the empiricism associated with the liberal conception of education implies a lack of knowledge about where empirical knowledge should "begin" and "end."

Empiricists can only "add" up the individual's various educational experiences and "put them together" into an aggregated whole. Without some view of the "whole," however, empiricist educators cannot put an order or a direction on our education, thereby integrating it in light of social or political purposes.

Multiple interests and approaches in education set up separate specialized courses or programs which do not interpenetrate in school even though they do in reality. When it is perceived that the requirements necessary for "complete citizenship" are not being met by the school, a new course of study (or a new kind of school) is added; there is a lack of concern with the overall education or curriculum of a student as it affects citizenship training, or with even better intetrating the aggregate subject material that presently exists. John Dewey was aware of this tendency in the curriculum over fifty years ago:

> The tendency to assign separate values to each study and to regard the curriculum in its entirety as a kind of composite made by the aggregation of segregated values is a result of the isolation of social groups and classes. Hence it is the business of the schools in a democratic social group to struggle against this isolation in order that the various interest (different courses of study) may reenforce and play into one another.[40]

For Dewey, the curriculum should be organized so that "the student is systematically led to utilize his earlier lessons to help understand the present one, and also to use the present to throw additional light upon what has already been acquired." A good curriculum is one that "puts the student in the habitual attitude of finding points of contact and mutual bearings" between his separate classes and between the "comprehensive material of direct instruction" and "the realities of everyday life."[41]

Taking the alternative participatory-republican conception as our model, what are the prospects for and implications of a more complete integration of the high school curriculum in light of the educational needs of democratic citizenship?

We first need to consider the integration of the social studies curriculum, since it is acknowledged by all to be the primary medium of citizen education in the secondary schools. One of the unfortunate (though consciously intended, as we saw above) results of the various reforms in social studies was the detachment of history from the main body of civic instruction. Current curricular approaches, from the attempt to add rigor to the disciplines of the social studies by studying the concepts and techniques of social scientists, to the focus on contemporary problems, "moral dilemmas," or the "process of valuing," have emphasized the contemporary and the trans-historical to the neglect of a historical perspective of politics. A rigorous understanding of history would seem essential to any understanding of "current events" and problems, social science concepts, or the development of values and moral judgment. But where the study of history has been present at all in the high schools, it is either subsumed in social science or made unappealing and irrelevant by going a mere parade of "facts," what some have called the "multiplication tables" of history.[42] It is more often separated completely from the "official" civics program, considered to be prior in sequence but not directly related to courses in government or citizen education.

A thorough understanding of history is critical to the education of democratic citizens. Thinkers in the participatory-republican tradition held that history was one of the chief studies in preparation for citizenship (and life in general). Rousseau argued that the study of history would teach Emile the workings of the human mind and heart and of human associations over time. History could properly distance Emile from the particular actions of "assembled men and peoples," and thus allow him to learn and to judge them in a disinterested way. Through history, the teacher could

> show (the student men from afar, to show him them in other times or other places and in such a way that he can see the stage without ever

> being able to act on it...It is by means of history that, without the lessons of philosophy, he will read the hearts of men; it is by means of history that he will see them, a simple spectator, disinterested and without passion, as their judge and not as their accomplice or accusor.[43]

History would not only teach Emile the collective genius and action of peoples past, but would enable him to compare peoples' ideals and speeches with their actions, a trait essential in preparing for citizenship:

> To know men, one must see them act. In society one hears them speak. They show their speeches and hide their actions. But in history their actions are unveiled, and one judges them on the basis of the facts. Even their talk helps in evaluating them, for in comparing what they do with what they say, one sees both what they are and what they want to appear to be. The more they disguise themselves, the better one knows them.[44]

If we follow Rousseau, a course of study which merely looks at contemporary governmental institutions and the principles behind them or at contemporary political problems, or one that attempts to develop a process of moral reasoning or valuing in individual students, neglects the important relationship between political principles and action, as well as the historical context in which principles and institutions develop. A thorough historical understanding allows us to better judge current problems, institutions, and values by showing us similar political situations over time, where we can disinterestedly examine them in all of their complexity and with all of their ramifications. History as a method of attaining disinterestedness would also seem useful to future citizens who will be asked to reach common agreement on policy in the midst of their own interests and prejudices.

Moreover, under the participatory--republican conception, a sense of history would be needed to provide and maintain the affective bonds and common political identities which undergird a democratic, conflict-transformation-oriented politics. The collective memories of past events, actions, heroes, villains, errors, triumphs, and important character traits and values must be strongly maintained, as well as constantly examined and interpreted in light of current political happen-

ings. All of this is best provided by a civic education which incorporates the lessons of history. Because "there is an identity to the polity that gives coherence and content to being a citizen," and since the "tradition of a polity" needs to be ever present to "guide and direct an individual as he acts in the present,"[45] a rigorous critical history needs to be provided as a primary part of the education of the participatory-republican citizen.

It is clear, then, that history ought to be fully integrated into the civics curriculum, interwoven into the study of democratic political institutions and principles rather than considered separately as a dry memorization of facts.[46] In addition, the social studies curriculum ought to integrate materials leading to the development of communications and rhetorical skills. The importance of discussion and debate to the participatory-republican model of democratic politics makes these verbal reasoning skills mandatory to future citizens. Stephen Bailey has argued that training in "negotiating skills" be a part of civics instruction. The rhetorical skills of persuasion and barbaining, the ability to come down from a "concrete" fixed position to discover areas of common agreement, and the psychic capacity to compromise (which goes against much of the American emphasis on winning, on holding fast to one's beliefs and positions, to not compromising) are necessary citizen attributes in a diverse society where conflict is seen as legitimate but yet surmountable.[47]

These are ways in which the social studies curriculum and its instructional materials could be made more conducive to the education of future democrats. But while the social studies curriculum is a good place to begin to address the contemporary problem of citizenship training in America, it will not do to end there. If we are serious about creating men and women capable of the wide range of skills and attitudes necessary for participation in democratic political life,

we must move beyond a concern with government or civics courses proper, to an examination of the impact of the entire curriculum on citizen education.

Plato, in his discussion of the cycle of decay among cities and men, partially blames an imbalanced education for the degeneration of citizen character. One reason why the "timocratic man" is less than ideal as a citizen is that he placed more value and time in his education on gymnastic than on music or dialectic. Similarly, "oligarchic" and democratic" man have an imbalance in the training of their reason and desires, with not enough time being spent developing their rational faculties, so that their desires inordinately direct their public activity. And the tyrant's character is completely imbalanced and immoderate, his education taken over completely by the most base desires and dreams, to the detriment of rational or intellective capacities.[48] It has been argued by contemporary educators that the Greek educational aim was the pursuit of excellence in "autonomous action," the citizen's aim being "to become an effective speaker of words and doer of deeds in the polity of one's peers." The kind of civic involvement the Greeks aimed at required engaged but unspecialized individuals. As such, it required the most broadly based, integrated course of study possible. It is only such a "general education" which "empowers autonomous particulars to think critically about the full range of human activity and to judge soundly any and all efforts at action."[49]

Some educators have come to the realization that the social studies are not the only agent of citizen education. After a long period of specialized instruction, it is beginning to be understood once again that many of the analytical and reasoning skills essential to good citizenship are better taught outside the social studies, in areas such as science and mathematics. Furthermore, the moral education that undergirds democratic political life requires an awareness that

all disciplines contribute to our understanding of values, of what the community has continued to place value in over time.[50] But while general concern with a total curriculum for citizenship is growing, the particulars have not yet been addressed. We need to look back to earlier political and educational thinkers to explore what might make up a total curriculum for the education of citizens.

In doing so, we will concentrate on three different modern thinkers' visions of such a total curriculum for citizenship: Benjamin Rush, Antonio Gramsci, and John Dewey. Though all three had somewhat different goals in mind, all are what this paper would consider to be broadly within the participatory-republican conception of democratic citizenship.

Benjamin Rush, writing in the early days of the American republic, articulated what he considered to be the proper "total" curriculum for citizens in a republic. Rush, like other republican thinkers, placed a heavy emphasis on the study of history, "the art of war," and "practical legislation" as key elements in civic training. But Rush was also intent on establishing a rigorous study of "the language of our country," which would include the "study of eloquence." This was essential to the civics curriculum since, for Rush, the development of powers of eloquence in each citizen is "the first accomplishment in a republic and often sets the whole machine of government in motion."[51] Rush's "republican curriculum" also included "vocal music," which he felt "civiliz[es] the mind and thereby prepar[es] it for the influence of religion and government"; intervals of manual labor mixed with those of study, which inculcates habits of industry, humility, association, and discipline; and even a proper and "temperate diet," which would not only yield healthy citizens but would also teach the psychological lessons of moderation and self-discipline which make up a part of the republican conception of citizen character.[52] Finally, Rush wanted Christian religion to

be taught as part of the public school curriculum. As opposed to those who were against "filling the minds of youth with religious prejudices," so that "they should be left to choose their own principles after they have arrived at an age in which they are capable of judging for themselves," Rush believed that children would run into religious principles in an unorganized way throughout childhood, and that instruction in religion would not only prepare them for free inquiry into the religion of their choice, but would be conducive to the creation of republican values in citizens:

> A Christian cannot fail of being a republican for every precept of the gospel inculcates those degrees of humility, self-denial, and brotherly kindness which are directly opposed to the pride of monarchy and the pageantry of a court.

Christianity is also conducive to republican political association and collective political action, since it teaches people "that no man 'liveth unto himself'."[53] Through this diverse but connected curriculum, Rush attempted to teach not only the practical and cognitive skills necessary to citizen participation in republican politics, but also the psychological and affective dispositions appropriate to a participatory-republican politics.

Though writing in a different country and century, Antonio Gramsci also considered the effect of the entire curriculum on the making of a democratic consciousness in citizens. The kind of all-around curriculum Gramsci proposed for developing democratic citizens was one which would be "disinterested," one that did not "have immediate or too immediate practical purposes."[54] A true civics curriculum, according to Gramsci, should emphasize the traditional disciplines of grammar, "descriptive philosophy" and logic, the study of classical languages, and mathematics, as well as the social studies disciplines of history and law. Gramsci proposed "the grammatical study of Latin and Greek" as a means of producing the kind of "disinterestedness" characteristic of the democratic personality:

> The real interest [of such study] was the interior development of personality, by means of the absorption and assimilation of the whole cultural past of modern European civilisation. Pupils did not learn Latin and Greek in order to speak them, to become waiters, interpreters or commercial letter writers. They learnt them in order to know at first hand the civilisation of Greece and Rome--a civilisation that was a necessary precondition of our modern civilisation: in other words, they learnt them in order to be themselves and know themselves consciously.[55]

The study of languages such as Latin and Greek not only develop "disinterestedness," but also fulfill a series of "pedagogical and psychological requirements" of democratic citizenship. For Gramsci, these languages are also studied

> in order to accustom children to studying in a specific manner, and to analysing an historical body which can be treated as a corpse which continually returns to life; in order to accustom them to reason, to think abstractly and schematically while remaining able to plunge back from abstraction into real and immediate life, to see in each fact or datum what is general and what is particular, to distinguish the concept from the specific instance.[56]

Gramsci also included philosophy, mathematics, and the rigorous study of Italian grammar as elements of an integrated course of study for future citizens, since he felt that they developed in the student the kind of "formal logic" which could be "assimilated in a living way" into political and civic discourse. When one adds these traditional disciplines to a course of social studies which teaches "rights and duties" and "the notions of the state and society as primordial elements of a new conception of the world" going beyond individual or family, one gets Gramsci's conception of the most adequate preparation for democratic life.[57]

The importance for Gramsci of teaching indirectly political subjects in conjunction with the "standard" civics program in history and government is clear. Gramsci held that only through these "non-political subjects" could one "inculcate certain habits of diligence, precision, poise, the ability to concentrate on specific subjects, which cannot be acquired without the mechanical repetition of disciplined and methodical acts," all of which one gets in courses of grammar, logic, and mathematics.[58] For Gramsci, this kind of integrated curriculum would

produce the kind of self-discipline and self-control necessary to democratic self-governance and an autonomous but yet cooperative politics. The "disinterested" nature of such a curriculum, according to Gramsci, would begin to teach the student the "disinterestedness" characteristic of laws and policies that result from a democratic decision making process. Gramsci opposed the educational reforms proposed by other Italian leftists, which called for greater student leeway in the choice of courses and a more practical or vocational program of study, which Gramsci felt had the "tendency to ease off the discipline of studies, and to ask for 'relaxation'."[59] Gramsci felt this more "vocational" or "elective" education was profoundly anti-democratic in reality, while appearing to be democratic, appealing to individual student "interests." Instead, his integrated curriculum was meant to provide a rigorous universal education for all students as a preparation for universal political participation.

John Dewey also conceived a broad-based curriculum as the best means of preparing citizens in the skills and values necessary to democratic political life. For Dewey, the student's experience was a single whole; it was a mistake to divide and classify the curriculum into separate subjects which rarely interpenetrate. Dewey's "civics program" consisted of mathematics and geometry, to develop abstract reasoning skills; courses in science to develop "concrete reasoning" ability and observation skills; history to inculcate in the student what Dewey calls "social reasoning"; education in languages, which aids in the development of memory (Dewey felt this was crucial for a democracy, where people's memories of the past are important to their proper judging and ruling on present and future policies); English literature, to better "hone" a student's skills in judgment, taste, and evaluation of standards; and courses in poetry (especially Greek and Latin poetry) and writing, meant to develop the student's imagination and ability to express himself clearly and forcefully (which, as we saw above,

is crucial to democratic discussion and debate). As with Rush and Gramsci, Dewey felt that by conceiving of a course of study which would prepare future citizens in an integrated fashion, one could produce people who were well-rounded, possessing all the cognitive skills and attitudes essential to participation in a democratic society.[60]

These thinkers' notions of a proper civics curriculum have not been presented in order to be copied by secondary schools today. They were writing in different times and places, and were responding to somewhat different circumstances. Nonetheless, they are meant to be taken seriously, since their ideas about the curriculum appropriate to citizenship education illustrate the importance of having a more integrated civics program which incorporates more than the traditional social studies fare typical of most contemporary secondary schools. These thinks realized that instruction in science, mathematics, literature, languages, art, and even music is critical in developing both the cognitive skills and affective attitudes which make up the characteristics of democratic citizens. They understood that only by thinking about the impact of the <u>total</u> curriculum upon the creation of citizen character can all of the attributes of citizenship be properly developed in conjunction with each other and brought together in the well-rounded democratic citizen. High school educators can learn from the thinkers discussed above that a better civic training for their students comes from a more integrated approach to the curriculum. Those concerned about the education of citizens must recognize that it is fruitless to concentrate on individual civics or social studies courses, since "from the student's point of view schooling is a synthesis of many experiences, not a collection of isolated encounters with particular teachers or subjects."[61]

This paper has just examined the role of curriculum in American citizenship education, and the implications of a participatory-republican conception of the democratic citizen for the curricular practices in American high schools. However, many contemporary writers argue that the current crisis in educational institutions is so severe that it is not enough to change the "civics" curriculum. For these educational reformers, the system of public schools as it is presently instituted is the greatest barrier to proper learning. Only when the very structure of public schooling in America is changed will children truly begin to be "educated," according to these educational critics.

Though many changes, from a back-to-basics approach to "open" or "free" schools and even "deschooling" have been proposed, this paper will examine perhaps the most viable structural alternative, a system of education vouchers, and its effect on civic education in American high schools.

Not only are voucher systems the most hotly debated alternative today, but proponents of other alternatives have also called for some type of education voucher or subsidy system as a way of implementing their proposed structural changes. Under such a system, parents would be given publicly funded tuition certificates which they could then use to send their child to any school, public or private, which participates in the voucher system. Although not a specific program of structural school reform, a voucher system has great ramifications for the structure of secondary schooling in America. And given the increased public acceptance it has been receiving over the past few years, it is important to discuss the implications an educational voucher system has for the education of democratic citizens.

Milton Friedman was one of the earliest advocates of a voucher system in education.[62] Friedman proposed establishing a system containing both public

and private schools, where parents would be paid "a sum equal to the estimated cost of educating a child in a public school," if they sent their child to an "approved" private school. These private schools would be able to set their own curriculum and admissions policies, and would operate like producers in the marketplace, trying to attract parents to consume their product. Friedman's reasoning was that a voucher system would be most effectively representative of all parents and students, and make educators finally accountable in the marketplace. For Friedman, the competition which would ensue from this free market approach would stimulate the "development and improvement of all schools." Parents would no longer be coerced into sending children to ineffective public schools (or else asked to "pay twice" for education if they sent them to private schools), and governments would no longer regulate mediocrity in schools and in teachers through their rigid and ineffective requirements about building or classroom size or teacher certification.

In more recent years, versions of Friedman's plan have been endorsed by other educational thinkers, most prominent among them James Coleman, whose most recent study comparing student achievement in private and public schools found that private school students did better on cognitive achievement tests than students from public schools, controlling for other variables. His study also found that, contrary to what opponents of private schools contend, only in the area of religious segregation was there a significant difference between private and public schools on whole--there was no overall difference between private and public schools on measures of racial segregation, and private schools were only slightly higher on measures of the economic segregation of students. Coleman concludes from this study that it is in the public interest to provide some form of tuition credit system for parents choosing to send children to private schools:

> The public interest in common institutions is not an overriding public interest. It is a relatively weak public interest when measured against the public interest in helping all children, particularly those of the disadvantaged, receive a better education. It is a relatively weak public interest when measured against the interests of children who are being directly and manifestly harmed by the school environment in which they find themselves, but who are unable to escape that environment.[63]

The most recent voucher proposal which has engendered national attention and debate was one offered as a constitutional amendment to the California State Constitution in 1982. Called the California Initiative for Family Choice, it was authored by John Coons and Stephen Sugarman, and would create two new types of schools in addition to public schools: Independent Public Schools and Family Choice Schools (the difference between them being that in the latter religion could be taught). Parents sending children to these participating alternative schools would receive publicly financed vouchers for 90% of what it costs to send a child to the regular public schools. Unlike the Friedman proposal, however, the Initiative for Family Choice would set state guidelines about basic requirements of education which must be met by all participating schools, about each school's public dissemination of information about itself, about the extent to which religious belief can be taught in schools, and most importantly, about mandated low-income admissions in all participating schools (set at 25% of student capacity). The Coons-Sugarman initiative is an attempt to combine the desirability of parents' free choice when it comes to their children's schooling, which characterizes other voucher proposals, with strict regulations mandating low-income student admissions in all schools, which reflects a legitimate concern about the uses of voucher systems to achieve racial or economic segregation.[64]

Arguments in favor of educational voucher systems are couched primarily in terms of the individual's right to receive a quality education that meets his needs and interests. Voucher proponents say that they would provide parents from all social and economic backgrounds with the freedom to choose among a variety

of schools offered the one that would best meet their children's needs and educational interests. One of Coon's major arguments is that the public schools today are voucher systems for the rich (who can move to wealthy neighborhoods) and compulsory poor quality schooling for the poor.[65] To the extent that a voucher system would open up opportunities to all children to get an "individualized" education that would meet their particular curricular interests, this would no longer be true.

But people also argue that the use of education vouchers would have positive political effects. To the extent that a voucher system encourages parents to actively seek out information about different schools and their offerings and them choose among them, it would bring about greater participation among people in the positive act of choosing their children's education. Coons contends that families who participate in the entire act of choosing their schools are more likely to be active participants in the school's life and governance and more public-minded, at least as it regards the "community" of their children's school. Citizens would be taking over authority in educational decision making that had been previously in the hands of state and school bureaucrats. Voucher systems could even mandate policy boards for each school consisting of parents, teachers, administrators, and even students, thereby increasing democratic control over education and providing "civic lessons" for those participants in the running of their local schools.[66]

Moveover, advocates of an educational voucher system maintain that to the extent that the public school today has increasingly become an institution without common purposes, goals, or values, where many children who do not want to be there are forced to attend, where problems of discipline and bureaucratic mediocrity have caused students to do poorer in many measurable cognitive achievement areas, and where children with parents who can afford it have opted out,

making it an increasingly segregated rather than an integrating institution, a voucher system would provide for schools that reflect public purposes. A voucher system could produce a variety of schools with their own "publics," and could rejuvenate the public schools to provide clientele services in the face of competition, bringing about a number of decentralized, face-to-face "communities" of common interest and purpose. In fact, some thinkers, though they may lament the decay of public schools, think that increasingly it is only private schools that can create "communities of value" so important to public (and citizen) education. Increasingly, only private schools may "have a public in the classical sense."[67]

Of course, many of these arguments assume the most ideal conditions for an educational voucher system. None of the proposals have so far mandated decision-making policy boards consisting of all parties in the private schools which participate in the voucher system, and there is strong evidence that many schools (especially sectarian schools) would object to community decision making concerning school policy. In addition, in an ethnically and religiously diverse society such as ours, a voucher system is likely to create schools which are divided along lines of homogeneity, further segregating educational experience in America. R. Freeman Butts has argued that a voucher system would probably not provide the "overall sense of political community needed for a visible public life."[68]

A major argument against voucher systems, then, is that they will further accelerate the trend toward privatism and away from support for public institutions. Parents will be able to withdraw from yet another public institution, sending their children to separate, specialized schools which will best serve their particular needs and interests. Rather than building common commitments to public purposes and to a potential political community (beginning in the public school) which was one reason public education was first instituted, voucher systems encourage the pursuit of private interests and desires at the expense of

public goals. While vouchers do offer the possibility of creating an active "public" around each individual school, as mentioned above, very little of the voucher movement expresses any concern with maintaining or creating a sense of civic feeling, but instead argues for their case in terms of cultural pluralism and the right to individually meaningful learning. Most parents want to create a climate where their children can do better on the accepted measures of cognitive achievement and so het ahead in life, rather than learn the lessons of democratic citizenship. In this sense, voucher systems tend to reflect a liberal conception of education, expressing little concern with creating political commitments or participatory attitudes through public schooling.[69]

Educational voucher systems would have a disastrous effect on citizen education. Since participating schools would probably have very few requirements imposed upon them to create certain programs for civic education, students would be denied both the infusion of a common history and culture through a common program of instruction (important for creating a sense of common heritage and purpose under both conceptions of civic education), and all the skills necessary to be self-governing and fully participating citizens. Without some kind of mandated civics curriculum, the policy cannot insure that students will have the proper training for future preparation in democratic political life, thus exacerbating the crisis of inadequate citizen education discussed at the outset of this dissertation.[70] Moreover, the very notion of democratic community as a place where people of diverse backgrounds and interests come together out of geographic or other necessity to search for common ground and meaning would be dashed by a system of separate schools most likely serving homogeneous groups who do not have to come together at all. It is the necessary character of political association

which distinguishes it from other forms of association, which are, to a greater extent, voluntary--this very distinctiveness is lost under a system of voluntary educational association. Thus, the participatory-republican conception of democratic politics and citizenship would not be served by an educational voucher system.

A related problem with voucher systems is that they may increase citizen passivity as well as privatism. While many voucher proponents do contend that vouchers will increase parental involvement in the schools and in educational policy, there is no evidence that this will happen. As mentioned above, most parents are not drawn to voucher systems by the promise of participation in educational policy and thus a renewal of civic life, but rather by the prospect of finding a school for their children that is acceptable to them. These parents want to find the kind of school that they can send their child to and not have to act any further, knowing their children's education "is now taken care of." In fact, in a voucher system, parents will be encouraged to think that they have done enough to send their child to an alternative school which embodies their educational philosophy and interests--thus the choice of school for their child would be their last (and not one in a series of) active political decision. Everything else would be left up to the school, even more than is now the case with public schools.

Thus, if voucher systems are proposed to provide for better parental control over, and participation in, their children's schools, it can be easily argued that parental control is likely to be more effective in the long run when undertaken in the public arena, within localized political institutions, rather than in a private contract or bargaining agreement with private school owners. The proposal to substitute the public school system which has the potential, if only

strengthened and renewed, of providing decentralized community control over education, with a market system which may not be very responsive to public need, does not seem to be the best way of regaining parental (or student) control over schooling.[71]

Rather than looking to any major structural reforms, all of which have major problems in terms of democratic citizenship education, we might instead attempt to focus on strengthening the educational institutions which already exist in America.

It is the comprehensive public high school, which exists as somewhat of an American anomaly in educational structures, which may provide the best model for a participatory-republican conception of democratic politics and citizen education. Ideally, the comprehensive high school brings together a heterogeneous population of students, with different backgrounds, interests, and professional and vocational ambitions, to instruct them in common lessons and values. In terms of size and format, the comprehensive high school meets the face-to-face requirements of participatory-republican politics, since most schools have between 400-4000 students, divided into small classes. With a proper curriculum and methods, the high school classroom can thus be turned into an embryonic community association, with students engaging each other (and the teacher) in lively discussion and deliberation over political matters. In terms of curriculum, the comprehensive public high school can better expose students to a diversity of disciplines under the same roof. And in terms of governance, the comprehensive high school can be readily brought under the democratic control of the entire community in and around the school itself.

If the object of citizen education is to prepare the young to enter into and cope with the life of the political community, the comprehensive high school

ideally represents a perfect mediating institution between the family and the polity.[72] As James Conant argues, the comprehensive public high school "endeavors to provide a general education for all future citizens on the basis of a common democratic understanding,"[73] and may therefore be the proper instrument of a democratic citizenship education. Proponents of alternative educational structures assume that the choice is between the public schools in their current disarray and their own idealized conceptions of a proper school system. In fact, the choice may really be between reformed structures likely to create the kinds of serious problems for the education of citizens discussed above and a commitment to renew the public high schools. If this is true, the latter course is the best possible guarantee of structures conducive to democratic citizen education.

The need for a restructured program of secondary school civic education is great. In light of the fact that our political problems have become more rather than less complex, and our effective participation in resolving them is required more now than ever, it is imperative that the education which equips citizens to exercise their rights and fulfill their public duties be up to the tasks we have set for it. Hannah Arendt has said that "education is the point at which we decide whether we love the world enough to assume responsibility for it and by the same token save it from that ruin which, except for renewal, except for the coming of the new and young, would be inevitable." According to Arendt, education is a process of preparing our children "in advance for the task of renewing a common world."[74] We must agree with Arendt that American society is undergoing a "crisis in education," especially in the education of its citizens. The challenge to American education is clear. We must rethink the way we go about "the task of renewing a common world" with our young, and change our educational practices accordingly.

In this paper, we have attempted to do just that, going back to a tradition in political theory of thinking about citizenship and civic education, to examine what it means to be a democratic citizen, and then pointing out some of the problems with practices in American citizenship education in light of this theoretical examination. If we have at least shed new light upon age-old questions about democratic political education and assisted in providing some of the answers, then this paper has succeeded.

Footnotes

[1]Quoted in Sheldon Wolin, "Higher Education and the Politics of Knowledge," democracy (Volume I, Number 2, April 1981), p. 38. See also Jean-Jacques Rousseau, The Government of Poland, Willmoore Kendall, ed. (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Educational Publishing, 1972), IV, p. 19.

[2]Robert Pranger, The Eclipse of Citizenship (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968), p. 3.

[3]Quoted in B. Frank Brown, "The Case for Citizenship Education," Education for Responsible Citizenship: The Report of the National Task Force on Citizenship Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1977), p. 3.

[4]See for example Roberta S. Sigel and Marilyn B. Hoskin, The Political Involvement of Adolescents (New Brunswick: Rutgers G. Niemi, The Political Character of Adolescence (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974); Paul Beck, "The Role of Agents in Political Socialization," in Stanley Renshon, ed., Handbook of Political Socialization (New York: The Free Press, 1977), pp. 115-141.

[5]While contemporary political scientists have doubted the rationality and educability of the American electorate, empirically denying claims for universal political education, education is thought increasingly important to other goals. Rush Welter contends that "modern American thought commonly denies the individual political competence, even when it seeks to ensure his economic competence through formal education"; see his Popular Education and Democratic Thought in America (New York: Columbia University Press, 1962), pp. 324-329.

[6]See Gerald Grant, "The Character of Education and the Education of Character," Daedalus (Summer 1981), pp. 140-144; David Tyack and Elizabeth Hansot, "Conflict and Consensus in American Public Education," Daedalus (Summer 1981), p. 19. Tyack and Hansot contend that categorical federal and state programs also tend to divide groups in the schools.

[7]Political socialization researchers might find fault with this emphasis on the secondary schools, since some of their studies have shown that the most important adult political attitudes are learned early in childhood.

However, the bulk of more recent research has found that attitudes learned early in childhood are extremely general and show great instability over time. One study in particular contends that sometime in adolescence attitudes toward authority change from those acquired in childhood. The adolescent individual begins to see political authorities as accountable, and invests the notion of authority with a strong participatory element, where only benevolence and unquestioned loyalty accompanied the child's vision of authority (see Dawson, Prewitt, and Dawson, Political Socialization, [Boston: Little, Brown, 1977], pp. 207-212). For more recent political socialization studies like these, it is only beginning with adolescence and beyond that lessons and attitudes more specific to adult political behavior are learned and persist in individuals (see also Sigel and Hoskin, op. cit.).

In addition, research in cognitive development has shown that it is not until adolescence that most children are capable of abstract or sociocentric thought, and thus able to grasp lessons of citizenship at all cognitive levels. It is only beginning with adolescence that students are at the cognitive levels appropriate to perceiving and discussing ideas and images, and to giving meaning to their disparate experiences. For these reasons, then, it is only at the high school level that we can adequately deal with the wide range of topics that make up the discussion about the civics curriculum.

Furthermore, it is not until until high school that direct study in "civics" assumes sophisticated proportions. It is only at the secondary school level that states and localities begin to mandate some form of civics or social studies instruction to provide for the education of youth in the lessons of future citizenship. At the same time, the curriculum in high school becomes highly spe- and divided among different subject areas, a significant problem for any proposals about better integrating the civics curriculum across subject fields, as we will see below.

[8]The liberal model reflects a conception of psychology, politics, and political education which has its roots in a tradition going all the way back to Thomas Hobbes and John Locke, and found in the writings of more modern "liberals" such as John Stuart Mill and John Rawls. In discussing this and the participatory-republican conception of democratic politics and citizenship, these and other individual thinkers will be used to illustrate the general arguments of each position. In discussing both conceptions of democratic politics and citizenship, individual thinkers will be used to illustrate the general arguments of each position. There are certainly differences between each of the thinkers illustrating both the liberal and participatory-republican conceptions, and it is unlikely that any one thinker holds steadfast to all of the notions set under "his" respective model. But there is a basic continuity and general consistency between the thinkers placed under each conception, and each conception has coherences as an alternative vision of democratic politics and citizenship. In the short space below, it will be impossible to pay attention to the differences between liberal and participatory-republican thinkers and to complexities and ambiguities within each conception. This paper will be primarily concerned with explicating each general model of psychology, politics and political education, understanding that each is an "ideal-type" which will be used as a heuristic device in exploring contemporary issues in American civic education, and not an iron cage within which to imprison various thinkers who are full of philosophical complexities. Ultimately, the reader will have to judge whether these conceptions are accurate and applicable to political and educational practices, and whether they intuitively make sense. As Hobbes might say, "this kind of doctrine admitteth no other demonstration."

[9]John Locke, Second Treaties of Government, ed. Peter Laslett, (New York: New American Library, 1960), paragraph 131, p. 398.

[10]See especially Locke, ibid., paragraph 124. pp. 395-396 and paragraph 125, p. 396; John Rawls, A Theory of Justice, (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1971), p. 554.

[12]In this participatory-republicans are not all that dissimilar from liberals. Liberals admit that individuals have ties to others; nature has given liberal man "inclinations" which "drive him into society" (Locke, op. cit., paragraph 361, pp. 361-362). As members of families, social organizations, and as friends,

individuals come together in cooperative fellowship with one another. While the liberal psychology does tend to see many of these associations as instrumental to the naturally self-interested man, there is still the recognition that "we need one another as partners in ways of life that are engaged in for their own sake" (Rawls, op. cit., pp. 522-523).

[13]Jane Mansbridge differentiates between "adversary" and "unitary" democracy on the basis of whether interests conflict (adversary) or are basically consensual (unitary). An adversary democracy calls for "each individual to be present, in some sense to protect his or her interests at the moment of decision" (p. 275). Unitary democracy has each member participating as a commitment to the common good in a politics of friendship. The problem with Mansbridge's categories, however, it that she has no notion of democratic politics transforming conflictual interests into a "common good," given an underlying sense of community. Her "unitary" democracy leaves out much of the meat of politics, i.e., discussion and debate among contending citizens over public issues and their resolution. See Beyond Adversary Democracy, (Basic Books, 1980).

[14]Rousseau, Political Economy, in Cole ed., pp. 297-298.

[15]Aristotle, Politics, III, i.

[16]"Letter to Joseph Cabell," in The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, H. A. Washington, ed. (Washington: Taylor and Maury, 1854), Vol. VI, pp. 543-544.

[17]Rousseau felt that "an individual may be a devout priest, a brave soldier, or a zealous senator, and yet a bad citizen" (Political Economy, p. 291). He then goes on to argue that Cato, the good citizen, ought to be held in higher esteem than Socrates, the good man and great philosopher. He ultimately calls for a combination of both: "We should be taught by one, and led by the other" (Ibid., p. 302).

[18]This is Rousseau's advice to The Government of Poland (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1972), Chapter 6, p. 30.

[19]See for example Judith Shklar, Men and Citizens: A Study of Rousseau's Social Theory, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969), pp. 155-163.

[20]Robert Barr, James L. Barth, S. Samuel Shermis, Defining the Social Studies (National Council for the Social Studies, 1977), pp. 19-20.

[21]Rolla Tryon, The Social Sciences as School Subjects, Part XI: Report of the Commission on Social Studies (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935), p. 176; see also NEA, Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary School Subjects (Washington: U.S. Bureau of Education, 1892), p. 190; Barr, et al., Ibid., pp. 18-21.

[22]Barr, et al., Ibid., pp. 22-28.

[23]James Conant's survey of over 2000 high schools in 1965 showed that 71% had a required course in "problems of democracy" or something similar to it; The Comprehensive High School, op. cit., pp. 33-35.

[24]Jerome Bruner's classic The Process of Education is considered by many to be the major influence here. Bruner contended that students of any age could be taught the underlying structures of the various disciplines in a meaningful way, and though he concluded from this that an integrated curriculum be supplied, most of his "followers" branched into separate fields of curriculum development. Typical of the "separate social science disciplines" approach was the publication of the influential Concepts and Structures in the New Social Studies Curriculum, by the Social Science Educational Consortium (Irving Morrissett, editor, Chicago: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967), in which a leading scholar from each separate discipline would lay out the conceptual approach to his subject's study, with little overlapping between disciplines. See also Barr, et al., Ibid., pp. 42-45.

[25]In Berelson's introduction to the National Council for the Social Studies' The Social Studies and the Social Sciences (New York: Harcourt Brace and World, 1962), pp. 6-7.

[26]Barr, et al., op. cit., p. 63.

[27]However, a 1969 ETS survey of the teaching of history and social studies in the secondary schools concluded that the organization and content of courses had not changed significantly over the previous 25 years, indicating that the New Social Studies may never really have been implemented in its "true spirit" in the high schools; see Elisabeth G. Kimball, A Survey of the Teaching of History and Social Studies in Secondary Schools (Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1969), pp. 3-4.

[28]Sidney Simon, "Values Clarification vs. Indoctrination," in Values Concepts and Techniques (Washington: National Education Association, 1976), p. 135. This concern about indoctrination is found in many educational writings concerning civics education. The National Council on Social Studies' recent document on values and valuing is typical of this concern that commitment to any set of values is dangerous: "Social studies professionals should not indoctrinate their students with any given form of governance, including democracy, but should rather place emphasis upon the development of skills in rational processes and decision making" (in Social Education, 1977, p. 305, emphasis added). This kind of statement forgets that, especially under a participatory-republican conception, commitment to a set of values is just as important to democratic citizenship as reasoning skills. Even many self-professed radicals critical of liberal-democracy feel that "values clarification" is the best method of teaching values, since "values imposition is a form of cultural imperialism and oppression that democratic education should work against" (though for some radicals, even "values clarification" is too biased!). Radical educators such as Campbell want to develop students whose only quality is a commitment to being critical, not understanding that criticism without any foundational values to base criticism on is meaningless. These radical educators end up being more liberal than their opponents, calling for an individual process of freely chosen values and the most possible diversity in curricula so as not to "indoctrinate" students in any way; see Duane Campbell, Education for a Democratic Society, (Cambridge, Mass: Schenkman Publishing Co., Inc., 1980), pp. 79-82.

[29]Simon, op. cit., pp. 135-143; see also Louis Raths, Merrill Harmon, and Sidney Simon, Values and Teaching (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc. 1966).

[30]See Andrew Oldenquist, "On the Nature of Citizenship," Educational Leadership (October 1980), pp. 30-33. See also Lasch, op. cit.

[31]Lawrence Kohlberg, "Stage and Sequence: The Cognitive-Development Approach to Socialization," in David Goslin, ed., Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research (Chicago: Rand-McNally and Co., 1969), pp. 347-480; also his article in Social Education (vol. 40, April 1976); Edwin Fenton, "The Implications of Lawrence Kohlberg's Research for Civic Education," Education for Responsible Citizenship: The Report of the National Task Force on Citizenship Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1977), pp. 97-132.

[32]Though Kohlberg is also interested in such "nonpolitical" curricula as English and Literature courses and their effect on moral development; see Fenton, Ibid., pp. 106-109.

[33]Fenton, Ibid., pp. 112-115.

[34]Ibid., pp. 107-109.

[35]In a sample of 2400 Illinois high school students, a majority said that civics courses did not increase their interest in government, public affairs, or politics (Illinois State Office of Education, Illinois Inventory of Teacher Expectation Results [Washington: ERIC, June 1980]). In the early 1970s, a study of high school seniors yielded complaints that secondary school civics courses failed to provide students with the skills and ability to analyze political decisions and values (Richard Remy, "High School Seniors' Attitudes Towards Their Civics and Government Instruction," Social Education, October 1972, p. 591). Langton and Jennings landmark socialization study in the late 1960s also found few positive changes in most students' political knowledge, information, efficacy, interest, or civic tolerance after taking high school civics courses (see Kenneth Langton and M. Kent Jennings, "Political Socialization and the High School Civics Curriculum in the U.S.," American Political Science Review [September 1968], pp. 852-867); see also Jennings and Niemi, The Political Character of Adolescence (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974), p. 205.

[36]Judith Torney, et al., Civic Education in Ten Countries (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1975), pp. 327-335.

[37]Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom, p. 183. A survey conducted in 1978 (in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware) by Research for Better Schools typifies this fragmented approach. The survey asked high school principals whether particular components of citizen education were offered as programs in their schools. While the results of the survey point out some important curricular omissions in civics in these three states, the survey itself is misconceived, as it fails to look at the overall civics curriculum in each school, instead focusing on these particular aspects separately; see Research for Better Schools, A Survey of Citizen Education Activities and Interest in Elementary, Middle/Junior High and Senior High Schools in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware: Final Report (Washington: ERIC, 1978).

[38]See, among others, James Shaver, "A Critical View of the Social Studies Profession," Social Education (April 1977), pp. 300-309. This lack of integration is also made manifest by the proliferation of specialized education journals, separated by both subject matter and level of instruction.

[39]Phillip Jackson, "Comprehending a Well-Run Comprehensive: A Report on a Visit to a Large Suburban High School," Daedalus (Fall 1981), pp. 86-89. This kind of "potpourri of courses" may not be conducive to creating a community of citizens who come together to discuss common problems and interests, especially in social studies and government course offerings.

[40]Dewey, Democracy and Education, p. 249.

[41]Ibid., p. 163.

[42]See Arthur Bestor, The Restoration of Learning (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956), pp. 126ff.

[43]Emile, IV, pp. 237-243; quote from p. 237.

[44]Ibid., p. 237.

[45]S.M. Shumer, "Republican Politics...," op. cit., p. 25.

[46]Ibid., para. 182, p. 146. Locke felt that without integrating the study of history with such other cognate disciplines as "chronology," "geography," and even geometry, history loses its power as a course of study. History separately studied becomes "only a jumble of matters of fact, confusedly heaped together without order or instruction."

[47]See Stephen Bailey, "Political and Social Purposes of Education," in Education for Responsible Citizenship, pp. 39-40.

[48]See Republic, Bocks VIII-IX.

[49]Robert McClintock, "The Dynamics of Decline: Why Education Can No Longer Be Liberal," Phi Delta Kappan (May 1979), pp. 636-640. Rousseau, in fashioning a proper education for Emile, also looked back to the Greeks, and especially Plato's Republic, which he called "the most beautiful educational treatise ever written"; Emile, I, p. 40.

[50]See Paul Hirst, "Liberal Education and the Nature of Knowledge," in H.D. Archambault, Philosophical Analysis and Education (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965), pp. 113-138. Michael Oakshott's understanding of education as a "conversation" over time carried on both in public and within each individual, an education which "gives place and character to every human activity and utterance," is a useful way of conceiving the rule a liberal, integrated curriculum plays in developing well-rounded men and citizens; see Rationalism and Politics and Other Essays (London: Methuen, 1962), pp. 198-199.

[51]Rush, "Thoughts Upon the Mode of Education Proper in a Republic," in Rudolph, ed., Essays on Education in the Early Republic (Harvard, 1965), pp. 18-19.

[52]Ibid., p. 15. Rousseau also believed work to be an important part of any child's "curriculum." For Rousseau, work teaches students a basic equality of status with others who "have to work," as well as humility, discipline, and dependence on other people. Work also provides one of the environmental backgrounds for developing ideas "on the basis of real relations" among men. Rousseau concludes in the Emile that "to work is...an indispensable duty for social man"; III, pp. 193-203. And in the Republic, Socrates contended that a "healthy city," adequate to provide for its people's needs and not "gorged with a bulky mass of things" (severely dependent on others for their subsistence to the point of engaging in war), was one in which citizens maintained a moderate diet; see Republic, 372a-373e, pp. 49-50.

[53]Rush, Ibid., p. 11.

[54]"On Education," Selections From the Prison Notebooks, ed. Hoare and Smith (New York: International Publishers, 1971), p. 40.

[55]Ibid., p. 37.

[56]Ibid., p. 38.

[57]Ibid., pp. 30, 42.

[58]Ibid., p. 37.

[59]Ibid., p. 42.

[60]Dewey, Democracy and Education, pp. 152-153, 243-245; see also The Child and the Curriculum, p. 6.

[61]Richard Merelman, "Democratic Politics and the Culture of American Education," American Political Science Review (Vol. 74, No. 2, June 1980), p. 319.

[62]Capitalism and Freedom (University of Chicago Press, 1962), pp. 85-107.

[63]Coleman, "Private Schools, Public Schools, and the Public Interest," Public Interest (Summer 1981), pp. 29-30; see also High School and Beyond: A Longitudinal Study for the 1980s, Public and Private Schools (Chicago: National Opinion Research Council, 1981), for the study results.

[64]The arguments for this type of voucher system are found in Coons and Sugarman, Education By Choice: The Case For Family Control (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978), and more recently defended in Coons "Reply to R. Freeman Butts," Phi Delta Kappan (September 1979), pp. 10-13; and Sugarman, "Family Choice in Education," (Oxford Review of Education, October 1980, pp. 31-40).

[65]"Reply to Butts," Ibid., pp. 10-11.

[66]In fact, Coons and Sugarman recognize that a voucher system without such policy boards would probably be counter to the whole idea of a voucher system as a system of free choice.

[67]See Gerald Grant, "The Character of Education and the Education of Character," Daedalus (Summer 1981), pp. 135-148.

[68]Butts, "Educational Vouchers: The Public Pursuit of the Private Purse," Phi Delta Kappan (September 1979), pp. 7-9.

[69]But voucher systems have been criticized by one contemporary liberal. Bruce Ackerman has criticized proposed voucher systems for being too willing to give complete authority to parents to impose a certain school on their children which simply reflects the very values that they have been inculcating in their children since birth. A voucher system, in Ackerman's mind, "legitimates a series of petty tyrannies in which like-minded parents club together to force-feed their children without restraint. Such an education is a mockery of the liberal ideal" (Social Justice in the Liberal State, (Yale, 1980), p. 160.

[70]Gransci made this argument in "On Education," op. cit., pp. 26ff.

[71]One possible alternative is one offered by educational writer Mario Fantini. He has proposed that instead of a voucher system consisting of participating private and public schools, we institute a system of "public schools of choice." The polity would establish different types of schools to serve students with different interests, but within the public school system, all under the control of the local community. Still, students within the schools in this system would be segregated according to specific method of instruction or instruction; see his Public Schools of Choice (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1973).

[72]See Oliver, Education and Community, (Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1976), pp. 8-10; though Oliver sees the attempt to make schools more communitarian is indeed problematic, given their diversity and the demands placed on them to produce "credentialized professionals."

[73]Conant, The Comprehensive High School, op. cit., pp. 4-5. Gramsci also felt that a common school for all pupils would best meet the demands of democratic citizen education, rather than a proliferation of specialized types of "vocational school" or individualized instruction which would "proliferate traditional social differences." Gramsci stated that "if one wishes to break this [oligarchic] pattern one needs, instead of multiplying and grading different types of vocational school, to create a single type of formative school, which would take the child up to a threshold of his choice of job, forming him during this time as a person capable of thinking, studying, and ruling--or controlling those who rule"; "On Education," p. 40.

[74]Hannah Arendt, "The Crisis in Education," in Between Past and Future, (New York: Penguin Books, 1954), p. 196.